



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 89th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 112

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 1966

No. 149

House of Representatives

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:
Trust in the Lord and do good.—Psalm 37: 3.

O God, our Father, eternal source of wisdom, power, and love, who art above us and within us, who dost keep the planets in their courses and yet art mindful of the faint whispers of our human hearts, before Thee we pause in reverence and awe, contemplating the grandeur of Thy being, the greatness of Thy power, and the glory of Thy love.

Keep us restless until we find our rest in Thee, keep us dissatisfied until we find our satisfaction in Thee, keep us in weakness until we find our strength in Thee.

Into our lives come appeals for causes, some of which are good and some of which are not good. We pray that by Thy spirit we may be led to make wise choices that our reactions may be good and for the good of all. Help us to keep our minds and hearts responsive to Thee, that Thy grace may find an outlet in our lives and that we and our Nation may be channels for Thy spirit to establish justice between men, good will within men, and peace in our world: through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, September 2, 1966, was read and approved.

H.R. 1426, FOR LOWER INTEREST RATES, SCHEDULED FOR FLOOR ACTION WEDNESDAY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House will open debate on H.R. 1426, the low interest bill of the 89th Congress.

This is a crucial issue for all Members of this House. This bill will give us a clear-cut vote on low interest versus high interest. We will know where every Member stands on this issue.

H.R. 1426 would lower interest rates to 4½ percent on certificates of deposit

under \$100,000 and would put the Congress plainly on record for lower and lower interest rates. If this bill is enacted, we will have taken a giant step in rolling back interest rates nationwide. We will have done much to correct the serious errors of the Federal Reserve Board when it raised interest rates 37½ percent last December.

The American people are watching this issue closely. They want concrete action to lower interest rates. They want action to put the homebuilding industry back into business. They want relief from this high interest gouging by the Federal Reserve Board. They do not want us to pass the buck.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to be on hand tomorrow to join in this battle against high interest rates. Later in today's Record, I shall place a series of questions and answers which outline basic points about H.R. 1426.

CORRECTION OF ROLL CALL

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, on roll-call No. 203, on August 8, 1966, a quorum call, I am recorded as absent. I was present and answered to my name. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent Record and Journal be corrected accordingly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, August 22, I spoke before this body in praise of the East Rochester Senior Little League World Champions. Since that date, I have noted that my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date contain certain errors and omissions which I would like to see corrected in the permanent Record. I therefore ask that my remarks of August 22 be amended in the permanent Record by adding the following paragraphs and making the indicated changes. I ask unanimous consent that the corrections appear in the Rec-

ord at this point and that the permanent bound Record be corrected accordingly.

First. Change the second complete paragraph on page 19291 to read:

Little League and East Rochester have been partners for many years. As a matter of fact, East Rochester fielded in 1950 one of the very first Little League teams in New York State.

Second. In the second complete paragraph in column three on page 19291 hyphenate the words "drum-and-bugle."

Third. In the fifth complete paragraph in column three on page 19291, hyphenate the word "co-volunteers."

Fourth. After the ninth complete paragraph on page 19291, add the following paragraph:

Also, credit must be given to the local school officials who have given aid and support to this team, in particular, the members of the School Board, Mark Harloff, David Topp, Mrs. Jean Doremus, and Ronald Spring. Additionally, much support and encouragement came from Louis O'Bourn, Superintendent of Schools; Frank O'Donnell, Principal of the High School; and Nicholas Verzella, Principal of the Junior High School.

Fifth. Before the first complete paragraph and after the paragraph ending with the word "victories" on page 19292, add the following paragraph:

Therefore, I want to give credit to various officials in the fire department who, in addition to Chief Bagley, have made this activity possible. I first want to salute the elected officers of the department: Leamon Williams, President; Bob Connolly, Vice President; Walt Brewer, Secretary; Earl Bechard, Treasurer. Praise should also be given to the work of Frank King, 1st Assistant Fire Chief, and Ed Van Thom, 2nd Assistant Fire Chief. All of these individuals deserve a vote of thanks for the support they have given to the East Rochester Little Leaguers.

Sixth. Omit the fourth complete paragraph on page 19292, column one, and add the following paragraphs:

Golfers will recall that East Rochester gave the Nation Sam Urzetta, winner of the National Amateur and member of two Walker Cup teams, and Mike Ferentz, holder of the National Public Links Crown in 1948. Jack Dianetti, the great track star, was an East Rochesterian, as was Arthur Ritchie, former State 440 Champ. The 1951 National

20809

September 6, 1966

Peterson Classic in bowling was rolled by East Rochester's Johnny Quinzi, brother of Pete Quinzi whom I mentioned a few moments ago. I also want to note that one of the young men now at West Point as the result of his success in competing for one of my service academy appointments, Ken Rice, was a standout athlete at East Rochester High School and has been a welcome addition to athletic teams at the U.S. Military Academy.

The athletic teams of the East Rochester High School have long been highly respected for their sportsmanship and their winning ways. Perhaps the most telling example of their consistent high performance is the fact that the basketball team has participated in post-season Section 5 tournament play in 19 of the past 23 years and has been victorious in seven of these competitions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ALLEGATION THAT FEDERAL "HANDOUTS" ARE BASED ON POLITICAL FAVORITISM

(Mr. MIZE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, in a front page article in this morning's Washington Post entitled "Campaign 66—The Battle Begins" among other things, the following was stated:

In the House races, which provide perhaps the best national barometer of public sentiment, the Democrats are showing exceptional strength. This is particularly true of the 71 freshmen, who have benefited both a large-scale public relations program and a lavish flow of Federal projects into their districts.

This implication that Federal "handouts" are based on political favoritism is a serious allegation; so serious, I challenge the Democratic leadership to deny the truth of the statement. If they do not, we must conclude it is true, and the American people should be made aware of the ends to which the incumbent administration will go to perpetuate a dangerous dynasty.

Mr. Speaker, will the real Democratic leadership please stand up?

NEED TO SEEK REALISTIC ASSISTANCE FROM ASIAN NATIONS IN VIETNAM

(Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ANDREWS of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, as the war in Vietnam continues to escalate, more and more consideration is being given here in Washington to a suggestion I made a year ago.

At that time I suggested to President Johnson that we must have more cooperation, more participation, and more fighting men from our allies in southeast Asia. Members of the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization certainly should be more interested in helping win this war on their very doorsteps—halting the takeover of Asia by the Communists.

We now have 400,000 men in Vietnam and experts tell us it will take 750,000

to end the conflict. I have just written the executive department urging the President and State Department again to seek realistic assistance from these Asian nations.

I also urged them to take positive steps toward setting up a peace conference of Asian nations with the single objective of finding a way to bring this seemingly endless war to an honorable conclusion.

It is obvious that Asians would be more receptive to the decisions of an all-Asian peace conference than they would to a European proposal out of the Geneva Conference. Asians are as deeply loyal to their heritage as people of any other nation.

More and more voices are being added to those urging an intensified effort toward peace—hastening the day when the Vietnam conflict will end.

ASSASSINATION OF PRIME MINISTER HENDRIK VERWOERD OF SOUTH AFRICA

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is my painful duty to announce the death by assassination at 8:37 a.m. this morning of the Prime Minister of South Africa, the Honorable Hendrik Verwoerd. The stabbing occurred just at the time the Parliament was convening and the bells were ringing. The Prime Minister was stabbed several times in the neck. Efforts were made to give him mouth-to-mouth resuscitation, but he died shortly after he was stabbed.

The assailant, according to the U.S. Embassy report, was previously assigned to the press gallery and heretofore had not been permitted on the assembly floor. Other parliamentary messengers said that he was a white man over 6 feet tall.

He came from the capital of Mozambique, according to information supplied to the U.S. Embassy.

Mr. Speaker, Americans deplore assassination whether in our own or in another nation. I am shocked by the report from South Africa, and I join with all Americans in reaffirming our faith that the dagger or the bullet of the political assassin can only block and never clear the road to progress and reform.

With most Americans, I disagreed violently with the Prime Minister on the morality of apartheid and on the whole concept of government by the minority, but I recognized him as a man of deep learning, great ability, and of abiding conviction in the righteousness of his course. The fact that I disagreed with him did not detract from my respect for his sincerity and his devotion to his duty as he saw it.

Mary Benson, well known South African authoress, testifying before the Subcommittee on Africa, of which I have the honor of being chairman, said:

I feel an extreme sense of urgency in testifying to you.

She had come all the way from South Africa and at her own expense especially to testify.

Miss Benson did not foresee the tragic assassination of the Prime Minister, but she felt that violence was on the horizon in her native country because there were wrongs there that trampled upon human rights.

Mr. Speaker, the assassination of the Prime Minister will not hasten the hour of the correction of those wrongs.

To the people of South Africa may I say for the people of the United States that we return to them intensified the expressions of horror, indignant resentment, and sympathy that they in their goodness of heart sent to us when assassination blackened our own horizon.

ADDITION TO LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. BOGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to announce for the benefit of the Members of the House that on tomorrow the conference report on the amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1960 will be called up for consideration in the House.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I will be very happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ARENDS. Will this be the first order of business tomorrow?

Mr. BOGGS. It is my understanding it will be the first order of business.

Mr. ARENDS. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana.

MAJORITY LEADER, CARL ALBERT, ENTERS BETHESDA NAVAL HOSPITAL

(Mr. BOGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I have the duty to announce to the House that the majority leader, our distinguished and beloved colleague, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], entered Bethesda Naval Hospital just a few minutes ago. We have been informed by his office that he has been ordered to rest for 2 or 3 weeks; he has had a minor coronary occlusion. The doctors assure us there are no complications. I have a copy of the release from his office which I will ask unanimous consent to include in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I may say I had the privilege of being with our distinguished majority leader on Sunday night, both with him and his lovely wife, and he seemed to be in very good health. He said he was tired. He had been moving from his home to an apartment. We expect to get full reports about him, and I am sure he will have a good recovery. He is beloved by everybody in the House, and I just wanted the Members of the House to know of this development. I

religious conviction who possessed true and abiding compassion for American working men and women. In the latter part of the 19th Century he applied the Angelic teachings of Pope Leo XIII's encyclical *Revum Novarum* in defending the rights of workers to organize into trade unions.

As an alumnus of the Catholic University of America I am most pleased to point out that he was the principal founder and the first Chancellor of the Catholic University. He was so universally admired that in 1911, on the occasion of his Golden Jubilee as priest and his Silver Jubilee as Cardinal, the most distinguished men in the United States, without regard to religion, gathered to pay him homage.

As we meet here on Labor Day, 1966 to rededicate ourselves to the unfinished tasks in the labor movement we particularly should have before us the bright image of Cardinal Gibbons in one of his manifold activities, that of defender of a democratic society.

Today we have a free society; we can and we must preserve it. We can preserve it best if we strengthen and expand the labor movement. Our organizations are truly the peoples lobby, working toward the social and economic improvement of all citizens, organized and unorganized. In the 1930's Franklin Roosevelt recognized the need for a bigger, stronger labor movement. He wanted to strengthen workers at the bargaining table and he wanted big unions as a countervailing force to big business in the political and economic processes. Through legislative and executive action he created a public atmosphere favorable to collective bargaining. Unparalleled growth in union membership resulted.

After the end of the Roosevelt era the rate of union growth declined. Technological change, more white collar workers, and other similar factors have been extremely significant. Anti-union legislation and less favorable attitudes of government over most of the period since World War II have had a very negative effect on growth.

In trying to ascertain the principal reason as to why the climate for collective bargaining has been less favorable, my conclusion is that almost all of the mass communication media, including newspapers, radio, television and periodicals are biased against unions and every day give evidence of such bias.

The influence of advertisers, capital requirements, employer orientation, etc. explain the general anti-labor history of the mass media but cannot justify it.

With the guarantee of freedom of the press in the First Amendment of the Constitution goes the obligation of responsibility—responsibility to tell citizens the true and undistorted facts about the events of the day.

In 1947 an eminent Commission on Freedom of the Press presented a Report which, in its five requirements, provided a theory of responsibility. The standards proposed are applicable to all mass communication media. They were:

1. The press must give a truthful, comprehensive, and intelligent account of the day's events in a context which gives them meaning.
2. The press must provide a forum for the exchange of comment and criticism.
3. The press must project a representative picture of the constituent groups in the society.
4. The press must present and clarify the goals and values of the society.
5. The press must provide full access to the day's intelligence.

Various plans have been advanced to achieve these standards as well as similar standards but without success.

Recently Mr. McGeorge Bundy made a proposal which I believe is definitely on point.

In behalf of the Ford Foundation Mr. Bundy asked the Federal Communications Commission to consider creating a non-profit corporation to distribute TV programs across the country through four fixed satellites, one in each time zone. Savings from the less expensive satellite distribution of commercial programs would be funneled into non-commercial or educational TV.

It is estimated that thirty million dollars per year could thus be made available for educational TV. Surprisingly, the American Broadcasting Company, N.B.C. and C.B.S., expressed immediate approval, in principle, of the Ford concept, while reserving comment on the details of the plan.

With stronger signals and adequate financing educational TV can bring an exciting new dimension to the quality of information, education and culture available to the American people. The possibility of free time for political candidates is conceivable through the new concept.

All citizens should examine and evaluate this new proposal and if it is workable we should support it.

Before closing I wish to publicly thank Archbishop Patrick O'Boyle for his steadfast and loyal support of organized labor for so many years. Words cannot convey the depth of our appreciation.

In the coming year let us try, most humbly, to emulate the righteous zeal of Cardinal Gibbons in the pursuit of social justice and the preservation of freedom.

CORPUS CHRISTI PROCLAIMS NATIONAL PARK SERVICE DAY

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, August 25 was the 50th anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service. I wish to add my congratulations to the many that were voiced on that historic occasion, to this organization which has done so much to conserve the natural history of America.

In Texas, the Service is doing outstanding work at Padre Island National Seashore, one of the most beautiful unspoiled seashores in America. It was a long tough 4-year fight to get the seashore approved by Congress, and as the author of the act I wish to commend the Park Service for the fine work they have done in implementing it.

Recently Corpus Christi, the city closest to Padre Island, passed a resolution proclaiming August 25, 1966, as National Park Service Day. I ask unanimous consent that the proclamation be printed at this point in the Record.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, August 25, 1966, will mark the 50th Anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service in the Department of Interior; and

Whereas, the purpose of the National Park Service is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historical objects and the wildlife therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations; and

Whereas, this area will greatly and lastingly benefit from the establishment and development of the Padre Island National Seashore area, one of the major recent additions to the national parks system:

Now, therefore, I, McIver Furman, Mayor of the City of Corpus Christi, deem it appropriate to remind our people of this anniversary

and its significance in preserving for posterity one of Texas' outstanding national wonders and to proclaim August 25, 1966, as "National Park Service Day" in the City of Corpus Christi, and to respectfully urge our citizenry to reflect upon our great fortune in having a part of this great park system virtually at our back door.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the City of Corpus Christi, Texas, to be affixed this 25th day of August, 1966.

McIVER FURMAN, M.D.,
Mayor, City of Corpus Christi, Tex.

THE LIONS PEACE ESSAY CONTEST

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, as a member of Lions International, I was most pleased to learn that Lions International—the world's largest service club organization—has announced sponsorship of the Lions peace essay contest.

This essay contest is open to any male or female who will be 14, but less than 22 years of age as of January 15, 1967. Awards will be made on several levels, ranging from the international level to the local club level.

The grand prize winner will receive a \$25,000 personal educational and/or career-assistance grant to be administered by the International Association of Lions Clubs. Each winner in the eight world geographical divisions will receive a \$1,000 cash prize, travel expense-paid trip to Lions International 50th Anniversary Convention in 1967, in Chicago, Ill., a gold medal, and a personalized division award plaque.

Mr. Edward M. Lindsey of Lawrenceburg, Tenn., international president of Lions International, announced the purpose of the contest is to focus the attention of people on the desirability of searching for ideas and developing a plan toward making world peace a reality.

Goals of the peace essay contest are: First. Discovery of a workable plan for world peace.

Second. Concentration of attention on the subject of world peace.

Third. The accentuation of the meaning of freedom and liberty.

This Lions International peace essay contest is a most commendable project. I trust it will meet with the full support of my colleagues.

VIETNAM—TESTING GROUND FOR THIRD WORLD WAR

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, in an article, entitled "This is the Third World War," the Economist of London has drawn a clear picture of how vital it is that the United States resist the so-called war of national liberation in Vietnam. The Economist points out that Vietnam, despite what we hear from some quarters, is, indeed, the testing ground for the theories of Mao Tse-tung and Lin Piao, the Red Chinese prophet who laid out the strategy of Peking in his now famous paper "On People's War" a year ago.

In view of Lin Piao's ascension to ever higher power, it behooves us to pay heed to his words. For, as the Economist notes, Mao is not backing down from Lin Piao's thesis. This is the most impor-

tant fact about Asia today. I ask unanimous consent that the article, published in the Economist for August 20, 1966, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Economist, Aug. 20, 1966]

THIS IS THE THIRD WORLD WAR

There is no Mao but Mao, and Lin Piao is his prophet. That is what the past week's events in Peking (see page 719) boil down to. The communiqué from the Chinese communists' central committee at the weekend, followed by the ominously martial rally in Peking on Thursday, with a uniformed Mao Tse-tung presenting his "close friend in combat" Lin Piao to the people, marks out unmistakably the path Mao means China to follow. It was predictable that the central committee, in the sort of words Stalin once made Russians use about him, would duly declare Mao Tse-tung a genius, "the greatest Marxist-Leninist of our era." After the Mao-organised purges of the last four months, and his baptism in the Yangtze last month, this was inevitable. Like all monopolists of temporal power, from the Roman emperors to Stalin, Mao is spending his last years in arranging to become a god.

What was not inevitable is the emergence of Marshal Lin Piao as China's number two, and the meaning this has for China's foreign policy. The only other Chinese mentioned by name among the encomiums to Mao in the central committee's communiqué—and twice at that—is Lin Piao. At Thursday's rally in Peking it was Lin Piao who took precedence immediately after Mao himself, before the country's president and prime minister and the communist party's secretary-general. It was Lin Piao who made the main speech under the approving gaze of Chairman Mao. Sick man or not, palely self-effacing or not, the defence minister has risen to the rank of Mao's chief assistant and his successor-apparent. He has done this partly because he can speak for the army, and partly because he has loyally used the army as a guinea-pig for the "cultural revolution" dose of salts with which Mao is now purging the whole country. But Lin Piao has probably risen for another reason too, and this is bad news.

A year ago Lin Piao wrote the famous article, "On People's War," which said that China's foreign policy was to encourage guerrilla wars in the "countryside of the world"—Asia, Africa and Latin America—in order to encircle and destroy the imperialists in the "cities of the world," north America and western Europe. The year that has passed since Lin Piao wrote his article has been a bad one for China's foreign policy, in Indonesia, in Africa and now even in North Korea (see page 721). It would have been reasonable to expect China to whistle its revolutionary tune under its breath this year. Not a bit of it. The central committee has picked out the Lin Piao article for a pat on the back as a scientific analysis of "the world revolution of our time." And Mao has picked out Lin Piao as his chief assistant. The meaning is clear. Mao Tse-tung, now almost mystical in his certainty, is not backing down one inch from his hopes of ideological expansion.

This is the most important fact about Asia today. It is the background against which the debate on American policy in the Far East has to be measured. Whether the United States has a job to do in Asia is not, at bottom, something to be decided in Washington. It has already been decided in Peking. The Americans were a Pacific power long before they became an Atlantic power. In Europe they have generally had a comforting layer of friendly countries between them and their main potential enemy, Germany or Russia. Across the Pacific, there is

nothing but cold water. That is why the Americans sent Commodore Perry to Japan a century ago, when all they were asking of Europe was to be left alone by it. It is why they now have virtually no choice but to resist what China is trying to do. No one else can. It will take the other Asians at least a decade to summon up the strength to look after China themselves. The British are still snarled up in the non-sequitor of thinking that belonging to Europe means not belonging to the rest of the world. The Russians took a long step in the right direction at Tashkent this year, when they declared their interest in the stability of the Indian subcontinent; but they have still not been able to bring themselves to say out loud that China's idea of universal revolution is a hell of a way to run the world. They probably will in the end. But meantime the Americans, and the Americans alone, are in a position to do something about the problem-man of the 1960s: Mao the evangelist, with his hot gospel of guerrilla liberation tucked under his arm.

None of this is really in dispute. Mr. Walter Lippmann, the most persistent and intelligent of President Johnson's critics, agrees that it is right for the United States to use its strength to establish a balance of power against the Chinese. The argument is about how much strength will be needed, and where it can best be applied.

It can be argued that in the end the whole business of restraining China's missionary zeal may turn out to be much easier than it looks right now. China is a very poor country indeed. An article on page 720 argues that its chances of ever becoming a rich one, or even of building up a modestly successful industry, are much dimmer than most people have usually assumed. If China does remain a poor country, its hope of inspiring revolutions all around the world will be rationed by the amount of help it can actually send to would-be revolutionaries. And that, to be fair to Mao, is all he aims to do. He is not an expansionist in the sense of wanting to push China's own territory beyond what he considers its historic boundaries. He just wants to spread the good word—but "out of the barrel of a gun." Ten years hence, if China is still too poor to export many guns and many missionaries, Lin Piao's thesis about "the revolution of our time" could look as punctured as President Nasser's grandiose aims of the 1950s look now. This is the optimistic way of looking at things. There is nothing wrong with hoping that the worst will not happen. But it is not a basis for policy. You look so stupid if the worst does come. Until and unless there is solid evidence that China does not intend to do what Lin Piao says it wants to do, or cannot do it, the only safe assumption for the Americans or anybody else to make is that the Chinese mean every word they say. That is where any sober Asia policy starts from.

That is where it starts from. Did it really have to lead to what is happening in Vietnam? Mr. Johnson's critics say that it need not have done. But lately it has looked very much as if some of the steam has been going out of the critics' arguments. This is not because they like this singularly beastly war any better than they used to. Nobody does. It is because, if one leaves aside the Marxists and the honourable pacifists, a good many of the critics are finding it increasingly hard to disagree with the basic premise of Mr. Johnson's policy—that it is at present America's job to try to keep China's evangelism under control. Having accepted that, they then find it increasingly hard to suggest any positive alternative to doing it in Vietnam. And every time Mao Tse-tung does something that seems to justify everybody's worst fears, the critics' job gets that much tougher.

Senator FULBRIGHT, for instance, has not

taken direct issue with the policy for Asia that President Johnson spelled out at White Sulphur Springs on July 12th. He preferred to argue that the President ought to have consulted Congress first. It is an argument that would have carried more weight if Mr. Truman had consulted Congress before deciding that the Americans must take over the job of defending Greece and Turkey—the "Truman doctrine"—in 1947. Mr. Lippmann, for his part, has walked into a couple of traps. He tried to argue on July 26th that there is no connection between the guerrilla war in Vietnam ("one small corner of the world") and other possible guerrilla wars that might follow it elsewhere. But Marshal Lin Piao saw the connection all right for China's purposes in the article on "people's war" that the Peking central committee has just commended:

"The people in other parts of the world will see . . . that what the Vietnamese people can do, they can do too."

That was one trap, and Mr. Lippmann dropped into it. The other is bigger and deeper, and goes right down to the fundamental question about the whole war: how can you defend the non-communist parts of Asia unless you are ready to fight a war in Asia? Mr. Lippmann says, quite rightly, that with the single exception of Korea in 1950 the United States has always avoided land wars in Asia like the plague. So he argues that the Americans should discharge their responsibility to the Asians by means of sea and air power alone—which means, in effect, by air power deployed from aircraft carriers and from islands off the Asian mainland. But Mr. Lippmann himself has scathingly pointed out how limited the uses of air power have been in Vietnam. If air power has not yet succeeded in tipping the scales in a war to which the Americans have committed 300,000 troops, how on earth can it protect non-communist Asia all by itself?

The blunt truth is that this is now an academic argument. China has nominated Vietnam as a test-case for what it claims to be a new kind of war. It is a land war, fought by relatively small formations of very brave men who are prepared to persist for years with the tactics of ambush and terrorism until the other side's nerve cracks. Those who believe that this technique of "people's war" should be opposed, because its aim is to set up an unacceptable form of society, have little choice but to fight it on its own terms: that is, by a land war. It is not the "right war in the right place." Defensive wars seldom are. It is not the sort of war that the Americans will be able to bring themselves to fight time and time again in other parts of the world. But if it comes out right in Vietnam, it will with luck not have to be fought all over again elsewhere. If the dissident minority in South Vietnam fails to take power by force of arms, dissident minorities in other places will think twice before they believe Lin Piao's tip that they are on to a winner.

But if the technique of "people's war" does succeed in Vietnam, the past week's events in Peking will take on a new light. Those who do not like the war in Vietnam, but equally do not want to see Mao Tse-tung's beliefs sweeping across Asia in a wave of guerrilla war, have a duty to ask themselves where else they think the wave can be stopped. Thailand? But the non-communist Thais are not going to call for help from a defeated American army, and in any case it is logically much harder to get help into Thailand than into Vietnam. Burma? Not on the cards. India, then? But the mind swerves away from the difficulty of doing anything to help that fragile country if the guerrillas once get to work in West Bengal or Kerala or wherever.

The fighting in Vietnam, it is said, could grow into the third world war. In a sense, it already is the third world war. It is not

September 6, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

20913

by the Americans' choice that this has become a testing-ground for the theories of Mao Tse-tung and Lin Piao. It need not have been. If there were any reasonable grounds for thinking that a communist victory in Vietnam would not be followed by communist bids for power in the rest of Asia—starting in Thailand, and moving from there towards India—it would not be necessary to make a stand in Vietnam. It would not be necessary if Lin Piao had not written what he has written, and had not now been given Mao's accolade for writing it. It would not be necessary if Russia were able to assert its authority over the communists of south-east Asia and guarantee that a stable truce line, like the line between the two parts of Germany, could be drawn along the Mekong between a communist Indochina and a non-communist Thailand. If either of those things applied, a deal could be done in Vietnam tomorrow. The only losers would be those South Vietnamese, Buddhists and Catholics alike, who keep on telling anyone who will listen that they do not want to be ruled by communists. It would be a cynical deal; but it could be struck.

The deal the Americans cannot reasonably be asked to strike is one that threatens to sell the pass to the whole of southern Asia. This is Mr. Johnson's enormous problem. It is also the problem of those who criticize his decision to take America into the war. Those of them—an increasing number—who agree that America has a responsibility towards the non-communist nations of Asia cannot dodge the question it poses. How else can you suggest holding the line, if not by fighting in Vietnam?

SCHOOL MILK EXTENSION PASSED BY HOUSE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on July 12 the Senate passed a child nutrition bill which among its several provisions included language extending the special milk program for schoolchildren through 1970. I am happy to say that an amended version of this legislation passed the House last Thursday. I am very hopeful that the Senate will accept this House version, which generally follows the Senate-passed bill. The alternative is a time-consuming conference which could jeopardize the final action on this legislation before Congress adjourns.

During my 9 years in the Senate, no legislation has received the strong support given the school milk extension proposal. When I introduced a bill making the program permanent earlier in the year, 67 of my Senate colleagues co-sponsored the measure. Similar bills were introduced in the House by well over 50 Congressmen.

Consequently, in my estimation, it can fairly be said that failure to act with dispatch to approve the House-passed bill, or an amended version of the bill as agreed on by a conference between the two Houses, will thwart the will of a substantial majority in both Houses of Congress. While I salute the House's action, I feel that both bodies must recognize the urgency of acting quickly to consolidate the gains already made.

MRS. OLGA T. WEBER, ORIGINATOR OF CONSTITUTION DAY CELEBRATIONS

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, Mrs. Olga T. Weber is a very special person

in the eyes of the residents of Louisville, Ohio. She is the originator of Constitution Day celebrations, the founder of the Constitution Day Committee, Inc., of Louisville, and the reason Louisville became known as the Constitution Town.

Mrs. Weber's tireless efforts in promoting patriotic endeavors are now being recognized by the State of Ohio. An invitation has been extended to her by the Historical Records Association to participate with biographical data for publication in "Ohio Lives," the Buckeye State's Who's Who.

I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the Louisville Herald on August 18 in regard to the honor accorded Mrs. Weber be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"OHIO LIVES", SEEKS BIBLIOGRAPHICAL DATA OF CONSTITUTION TOWN'S OLGA T. WEBER

The Historical Record Association proudly announces the publication of "Ohio Lives," the Buckeye State's Who's Who!

Ralph Waldo Emerson once said, "There is properly no history; only biography." And the Historical Record Association says, "Your own life record is an important chapter in Ohio History."

The Association directs this statement to those invited to participate with biographical data for publication of "Ohio Lives."

The invitation has been issued to Mrs. Olga T. Weber of Louisville and, in part, reads:

"In recognition of your accomplishments and contributions to your community, state and nation, you are invited to be included with notable Ohioans in our forthcoming publication, "Ohio Lives," the Buckeye Who's Who, which is now being produced under the editorship of Dr. Clyde Hissong, formerly Ohio State Superintendent of Public Instruction."

It continues: "There is presently a dearth of record that gives the life of our present-day leaders. Ohio Lives will furnish libraries, schools, newspapers and individuals with a source of carefully selected biographical material of Ohioans and will be widely distributed in Ohio as well as in the nation. Invitations are being issued to those who are designated by the supervising editor, Dr. Hissong, with the assistance and recommendations of the Editorial Advisory Board. They represent leadership in the professions, finance, business, agriculture, politics, religion, education and culture in their communities. Local and state records are studied to determine eligibility of nominees. These people are being invited to furnish biographical data of themselves to assure accuracy of the edition."

"Ohio Lives will be a handsome volume, elaborately printed and permanently bound in a rigid artcraft binding with lettering in gold. It will be a beautiful addition to any library and a ready source of information about prominent Ohioans you know or are likely to meet. It will be tangible records of lives that will be passed on to future generations."

The publication is a public service performed by a private enterprise organization of long experience and enviable record.

NEED FOR 12-MILE FISHERY ZONE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, it is apparent to me that there is considerable doubt on the part of members of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee as to the critical value of the

passage of the 12-mile fishery zone bill in the present Congress.

I cannot subscribe to the objections of some segments of the American fishing industry that the bill will adversely affect their present relations with South American nations, off whose shores they presently fish. It is my feeling that a strong position in behalf of America's fishermen by reserving this additional 9-mile protective and conservation zone will assist us immeasurably in our international negotiations on fisheries questions. If we do not take action on this matter in the 89th Congress, it seems to me that we are clearly advising the world fisheries community that America does not care very much about her fishermen, and further, welcomes the plunder of her adjacent coastal resources.

It is intolerable that the United States should be forced to negotiate a 12-mile agreement with the Soviet Union. The Soviets have 12-mile protection, and our fishermen are certainly deserving of equal consideration. Everyday of delay means that tons more of these resources are finding their way into the holds of the Soviet fleet, while our own fishermen suffer from the antiquated protection of 3 miles.

There seems to be no question that some segments of the American fishery industry have made a convincing case against this apparent need. Mr. George Johansen, the secretary-treasurer of the Alaska Fishermen's Union, whose jurisdiction also extends to crewmen aboard coastal trawlers, has written some thoughtful answers to the case made by the American tuna fishermen who fish off South America. It seems to me that this discussion is of such interest that it should be made available to every Member of Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Johansen's letter be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALASKA FISHERMEN'S UNION,
Seattle, Wash., August 5, 1966.

To: Washington State congressional delegation and other Members of Congress.
Subject: The conservation and preservation of U.S. coastal fishery stocks.

GENTLEMEN: It has been brought to our attention that during the recent discussions on HR 9531 (the 12-mile limit fishery bill), the tuna industry advanced a number of reasons why this bill or similar bills should not be reported at this time. We do not believe those reasons to be valid. We feel that if Congress were to follow the "no action" recommendations, not only would the United States lose a big part of its domestic fisheries, but more importantly, we would lose respect and could conceivably be subject to additional abuses from those countries which have made excessive claims for fishery jurisdiction.

Following are the reasons advanced by the tuna industry why HR 9531 or any similar bills should not be reported at this time, and our replies:

1. No action should be taken until the technical discussions recently agreed to by the USSR and which are about to take place have come to a final conclusion.

Answer: If the United States fails to exhibit proper concern at this time as to coastal fishery resources by rejecting legislation which will provide considerable protection in

the immediate future, it can only have the effect of encouraging increased fishing efforts by Russia, and, in the final analysis, will make a meaningful treaty or agreement more difficult to obtain. It should also be noted Russia has already adopted the 12-mile limit.

2. No action should be taken until S.J. Res. 29 has been enacted and a report submitted. At this time we do not know the extent and importance of the domestic resources actually involved.

Answer: We are strong believers in the intent and purpose of S.J. Res. 29. It is regrettable legislation of this type was not enacted several years ago. However, this Joint Resolution provides for a rather extensive undertaking, one which could not be concluded within a short period of time. The millions upon millions of pounds of fish harvested weekly and monthly by the Russians do not allow for an unlimited waiting time, but call for action NOW, not sometime in the future. Their take is approximately one hundred million pounds as of this date, and will exceed a quarter billion pounds at the end of 1966.

3. No action should be taken until we have better data concerning the possible impact on U.S.-based distant water fisheries, e.g. shrimp and tuna, both of which are fished to an important degree inside 12 miles of the coast of, and around islands belonging to, other countries.

Answer: One must assume that most of the fish caught by United States citizens on foreign coasts consist of tuna. Contrary to arguments advanced by the tuna industry, passage of this legislation would not bring about a change for the worse, as far as conditions which now exist with respect to American fishermen fishing in South American waters, in our opinion. These South American countries have already promulgated fishery limits far in excess of anything contemplated by HR 9531. It is reasonable to assume they will continue their harassing efforts in the future, and we see no reason why the passage or non-passage of this bill would make any difference. In any event, charity begins at home—we are far more concerned with the fisheries resources immediately adjacent to our coasts. We believe it is the responsibility of the United States to protect the stocks that have been so carefully preserved for the use of present and future generations, as far as it is possible for us to do so.

4. No action should be taken until the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries has had an opportunity to hold more extensive hearings to receive the testimony of experts in the field of international law of the sea in an atmosphere not characterized by the hysteria and emotions generated by the recent Russian activities.

Answer: We can understand the reluctance of an industry (which, in the nature of its business, is fishing off foreign shores) to accept any restrictions in relation to extension of fishery limits. We do not believe the extension of our present territorial 3-mile limit to twelve miles for fishery purposes presents any complications in the field of international law. The table inserted in the Senate hearings on S. 2218 shows an overwhelming majority of the world's coastal nations have adopted a fishery limit of more than three miles. In a letter to Senator Magnuson, Douglas MacArthur II, Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations stated:

"In view of the recent developments in international practice, action by the United States at this time to establish an exclusive fishery zone extending 9 miles beyond the territorial sea would not be contrary to international law and it should be emphasized that such action would not extend the territorial sea beyond our traditional 3-mile limit and would not affect such traditional

freedoms of the sea as freedom of navigation or of overflying."

While there have been considerable exchanges of views between countries because of the extension of fishery limits, there has been no serious challenge as to the validity of these actions (taken mostly on a unilateral basis) under international law. We do not subscribe to a philosophy which makes it possible for other countries to take unilateral action but which denies this same privilege to the United States. In our opinion, if these actions that have already been accomplished by those coastal nations which extended their fishery limits did not produce complications under international law, the fact that the United States followed the example by the majority of nations should render international law complications exceedingly remote.

Of course, if the opponents of H.R. 9531 succeeded in entangling this proposed legislation in a number of international law questions, this would, of course, produce endless delays and give Russia and Japan ample time to decimate United States coastal fisheries resources.

5. No action should be taken until an attempt has been made to implement the 1958 Geneva Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas, and the results of that effort analyzed.

Answer: We believe the 1958 Geneva Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas should be implemented at the earliest possible moment and that general rules for conservation and contiguous zones encompassing the inhabited areas of the fishery stocks in question, should be established. However, it appears to us that extending such contiguous conservation zones from the 12-mile limit instead of the 3-miles, will enhance the protection for United States stocks.

6. No action should be taken on the basis that this legislation provides any real protection to stocks of fish contiguous to our coast. Except for limited stocks of shrimp and crab off the west coast states, most other species migrate freely beyond any 12-mile line.

Answer: In the nature of things, one must crawl before he can walk. In order to obtain complete protection for our coastal stocks of fish, our present territorial limits would have to be extended several hundred miles. We cannot reasonably expect such results, and therefore we consider the present legislation a good start in the right direction. We would gain much protection in the State of Alaska where 12 miles would prohibit the entry of foreign fishermen in a good many inlets and bays now open to international fishing. One must consider that any distance one can remove a foreign fishery vessel from our shoreline is a help. With the pressure of Japan and Russia steadily increasing, we need all the help we can get. This is exceptionally true legislatively because federal legislation enacted into law is a declaration—more than by any other means—of the purpose and intent of Congress to render its best efforts to preserve and protect our fisheries.

7. No actions should be taken on the basis that this legislation solves any of the problems confronting our coastal fisheries. No single witness claimed the bills are any more than "a step in the right direction".

Answer: We, of course, agree with the tuna industry that it is not a complete package. We do need contiguous fishery conservation zones in addition to what this legislation will accomplish. It would be most desirable to find complete solutions, but seldom, if ever, are such results obtained—except by degrees. Steps in the right direction spell progress for which we in the Pacific Northwest and Alaska are most thankful.

The tuna industry goes on to say that passage of such legislation will:

A. Create problems of jurisdiction as between the several states and between the states and the Federal Government.

Answer: We do not believe this legislation will create problems of jurisdiction between the several states individually or between the states and the federal government. The pending legislation provides United States jurisdiction with respect to the additional 9-mile fishery zone when the bill states that "the jurisdiction of the United States extends to all waters in the zone and the United States will exercise the same exclusive rights in respect to fisheries in the zone as it has in its territorial sea, subject to the continuation of traditional fishing by foreign states within this zone as may be recognized by the United States".

To a layman, the language quoted seems conclusive and should eliminate problems of jurisdiction between the states and the Federal Government.

B. Create problems between the United States and other friendly nations, e.g. Canada, Japan, and Mexico.

Answer: Canada has already declared a 12-mile limit for fishery purposes. At the present time, the Canadians are recognizing historical fishing rights of United States citizens. In our opinion, our position of bargaining with Canada in the future would be greatly improved with the adoption of a 12-mile limit.

Japan, of course, can be depended upon to oppose any extension of fishery limits. It would not be in the national interests of Japan to agree to legislation of this kind, but Japan has to face 12-mile limits on the coasts of other countries, and there is no reason to believe that the adoption of this legislation will create more problems with Japan than those we already have. Japan is one of the countries which makes it necessary for the United States to adopt an extension of the present fishery limit and to establish fishery conservation zones. The steady fishing pressure exerted by both Japan and Russia on the Pacific Coast stocks will call for more protection in the future, not less.

In relation to Mexico, we have a number of problems at the present time which have been with us for a good many years. It seems to us that in view of the almost general adoption of a 12-mile limit by the majority of the coastal nations of the world, sooner or later this problem will have to be worked out with Mexico. We have been able to work with Canada, our neighbor to the north, and it is our belief we will equally be able to work out existing problems with Mexico.

C. Trigger exaggerated and excessive retaliatory claims and actions by other nations, especially the Latin American nations off whose shores our shrimp and tuna fishermen operate on the high seas.

Answer: We do not follow nor can we understand why the adoption of a 12-mile limit by the United States should trigger exaggerated, excessive and retaliatory claims and actions by South American countries. There is nothing in this legislation which will in any way be injurious to any of these countries which do not fish off the coasts of the United States. Consequently, we reject alleged contentions of retaliatory actions by South American countries as unfounded.

D. Create problems concerning the administration of the Nicholson Act (46 U.S.C. 251), and the Fishermen's Protective Act, PL 680, 83rd Congress.

Answer: During the Senate hearings on S. 2218, there was considerable discussion in regard to the tuna industry's position that passage of the 12-mile limit bill would create problems as far as the Nicholson Act is concerned. Problems arise because of differences in interpretations as to the meaning and intent of specific law. It is our understanding that the contiguous fishery zone

September 6, 1966

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A4673

and—at least by implication—scolding the Johnson administration for not forcing the rates down. Mr. Truman broke a self-imposed rule of silence to warn that high interest could lead to a depression.

Worry over the trend in interest rates is by no means confined to Democrats and ex-Presidents. Anyone who has had to borrow to buy a house or a car or to keep his business going knows all too well what a pinch has overtaken the money market in recent months. But unanimous concern has failed to produce a consensus as to what to do about it.

Mr. Truman says the "drastic increase in interest rates has been imposed on the American economy," as though the rise were some dark plot hatched by the bankers. AFL-CIO President George Meany and other "easy money" advocates seem to think that if only the rates were knocked down by edict the problem would disappear.

This is a little like saying that if you just powder over the spots, the patient will no longer have measles.

The basic fact here is that money reacts to the law of supply and demand just as products and commodities do. Demand is strong because the economy is straining under the forced draft of the war in Viet Nam plus the burgeoning needs of the Great Society. The supply of money is limited. Competition to borrow what is available naturally forces up the price.

Arbitrary curbs on interest rates could scarcely succeed without a lid on prices and wages across the board. And in that direction lies a totalitarian control of the economy with all the evils that go with it. We cannot believe that even the loudest proponents of easy money want that.

Yet the alternative to this meddlesome route is to drive interest rates down by expansion of the money supply. And this is inflation, pure and simple, for money thus pumped into the supply line quickly dilutes the value of money.

What the high interest rates are primarily telling us is that the economy is getting out of balance—and the stock market has already got the message. High interest has a braking effect on the inflationary trend, and if it were operating in tandem with sound fiscal policy the effect could be beneficial rather than otherwise.

Unfortunately, monetary policy is applying a brake while the government's fiscal policy of overspending and deficit financing still pushes the accelerator to the floorboard. No wonder fears are rising that the machine may be going into a skid.

The 50th Anniversary of Lions International

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. CLAIR CALLAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 6, 1966

Mr. CALLAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my personal applause at this to the International Association of Lions Clubs, the world's largest service club organization.

For some time, I have observed with sincere thankfulness the work of Lion's International in the field of visual impairment. Numerous programs, actively supported by the more than 20,000 Lions clubs in the world, have been undertaken to aid those who are visually impaired

and to promote eye care among all peoples.

The several civic programs carried out by Lions International are all tailored to the organization's deep involvement in humanitarian activities and the fostering of better understanding among the people of the free world.

In this the 50th year of organization for Lions International it is befitting the past performances of the 800,000 members of Lions International that a new and exciting undertaking is being initiated. That undertaking is a worldwide essay contest on the subject "Peace Is Attainable." Launching of this great new project is in keeping with the theme "Search for Peace."

Promotion of the search for ideas designed to make world peace a reality is the worthiest and most commendable of goals. Judging from the past successes of Lions International, I believe all the peoples in this Nation and in this world can take heart from this new effort.

The Serviceman's Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 6, 1966

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from South Carolina, L. MENDEL RIVERS, as chairman of the Armed Services Committee, has earned himself a special place in the hearts of America's military men. The special respect and affection that members of the Armed Forces have for MENDEL RIVERS is tellingly described in an editorial, "The Serviceman's Congressman," in the August issue of Naval Affairs, the magazine of the Fleet Reserve Association.

As one who proudly boasts of being an honorary member of New Orleans Branch 92 of the FRA, I am pleased to call this editorial to the attention of the House.

The force and clarity of this editorial is not surprising in view of the initials with which it is signed—R. W. N. Those initials signify Robert W. Nolan, who, in his brief period as national executive secretary of the FRA, has become widely known, respected, and trusted on Capitol Hill as a spokesman for the enlisted man. He is a tireless worker for the 65,000 FRA members and is singularly qualified to pick the "Serviceman's Congressman."

The editorial follows:

THE SERVICEMAN'S CONGRESSMAN

Ask the average American of voting age who is his United States Representative and chances are he will be unable to tell you. Ask the average American Serviceman the same question and he will quickly reply, "Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS!"

To the average American, his Congressman knows his problems, represents his interests and works in his behalf. In matters of military personnel this describes the Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee to a "T." That is why today's G.I., no matter

which of the fifty states he is from, considers Chairman RIVERS his Congressman.

We recently received a letter from one of our Shipmates in Vietnam stating, "if a presidential nomination and election were held now, with only the military voting, Chairman L. MENDEL RIVERS would be elected hands down."

The shipmate was expressing the feelings of thousands and thousands of servicemen, active duty or retired. Chairman RIVERS has earned this loyalty not only because he knows and cares about the problems of service personnel but because he is doing something to resolve those problems.

When he assumed the Chairmanship of this key Congressional Committee eighteen months ago, everyone was aware that he had a big pair of boots to fill. For he succeeded Representative Carl Vinson and "Uncle Carl" had an unprecedented fifty years of accomplishments behind him.

Chairman RIVERS is handling his new duties in a seamanlike manner. He understands the principles of team work and the delegation of responsibility. His thirty-seven man Committee is the more active and stronger because of this. Party affiliations are erased by the need to provide for the nation's security.

He knows his colleagues in the House and Senate well. His leadership is making possible realistic legislation. Witness the progressive military legislation enacted during the past eighteen months.

His differences with his opponents within the Administration are honest differences that stem from his belief that the Congress is an equal partner on our national defense team. He knows that the Constitution grants certain powers and responsibilities to each branch of Government. He intends for his Committee to exercise the powers granted to it.

It is in pursuit of this belief that he has initiated firm, progressive action in military personnel matters. His accomplishments of the past herald an even brighter future for our nation's fighting men. He fully recognizes the needs of the man behind the gun and intends to provide for those needs.

That is why L. MENDEL RIVERS is the Serviceman's Congressman.

R.W.N.

Vietnam Peace Conference Proposed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT TENZER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, August 8, 1966

Mr. TENZER. Mr. Speaker, the war in Vietnam has taken on an increasingly dangerous turn. Our engagement in South Vietnam is the most important and troublesome problem facing the Nation today. The people in my district are concerned and vexed by its complexities and its tragedies. I, therefore, deem it incumbent upon me to once again speak out to my distinguished colleagues on this issue.

I firmly support the traditional American spirit of free and open debate, hopefully, we may gain enlightenment from these talks. Our voices, however, need not always be raised in dissent—merely for the sake of dissent—but rather in the spirit of constructive purposeful proposal.

I have supported and will continue to support our basic commitment to the

A4674

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

September 6, 1966

people of South Vietnam—our determination to allow these people to lead lives of dignity and freedom, with the right to choose their own form of government, free from aggression from without.

I have also supported all legislation to uphold the hands of our fighting men in South Vietnam. But I am at the same time deeply distressed, by what appears to be a continued prolongation and intensification of the war. We seem to be indeterminately sinking deeper and deeper into the perilous quagmire of an extended land war on the continent of Asia.

That is why, in March of 1965, I was among the first, if not the first, Member of Congress to conduct an open forum on Vietnam. More than 300 concerned citizens came to hear a State Department spokesman explain the basis for the U.S. commitment in South Vietnam. My constituents in turn expressed their views freely and all who were privileged to be present profited by the experience.

Shortly after the public forum, I was one of the first Members of Congress to propose a pause in the bombing as evidence of our desire for peace.

In the month of December 1965, I was among the first to urge the President to accept the Christmas truce and because the lines of communication were thus opened to extend the truce and the bombing. I was disappointed that the 38-day pause did not result in a reciprocal deescalation of the conflict.

In January 1965, I joined with 78 colleagues urging the President to continue his policy of measured restraint and not to consider our vote in favor of the defense appropriation bill as an indication that we favor an escalation of the conflict.

In July 1966, I was one of 47 Members of the House who criticized Premier Ky's irresponsible proposal for escalation of the war.

In August 1966, I was one of 22 Representatives in Congress who spoke out in favor of an Asian conference.

In August 1966, I joined with 177 of my colleagues in urging U Thant to continue as Secretary General of the United Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I firmly believe that all of these actions were consistent and in harmony with our President's policy of measured restraint and his earnest desires for peace. I have never been able to understand Hanoi's refusal to negotiate.

I feel, therefore, that it is now even more urgent for us to increase our efforts to bring about a reciprocal deescalation of military activities in Vietnam and a cease-fire, and to approach the termination of our own military involvement.

To accomplish this noble purpose I have sent the following letter to our President outlining my proposals for convening a Vietnam peace conference:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., August 1966.

President LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The conflict in Vietnam is the number one problem troubling most of my constituents. The increasingly

dangerous course which the conflict is taking is of grave concern to all of us. Recent developments make it even more urgent, that we intensify our efforts to search for peace through diplomatic channels and by political means.

I recognize that our foreign policy is based on the principle that we encourage the development of a community of nations exercising the freedom to choose their own form of government. That is why our basic commitment to South Vietnam is morally correct. At the same time, a great Nation must have an equally great commitment to peace, and it is to this I wish to address myself.

I have told my constituents that you want peace as much as I do, and as much as they do. I have told them that you have the greater responsibility in making the day-to-day and hour-to-hour decisions.

I have told them of your efforts to search out peace and of your numerous proposals for peace. I related how you searched without success for signs of reciprocal deescalation during the two pauses in the bombing.

Our Nation is the greatest and the strongest in the world and with that greater strength goes greater responsibility. Therefore, in exercising and carrying out that responsibility I suggest that we show to the nations of the world, and to our troubled citizens at home, that we can match our greater strength with even greater humility—because our common objective is world peace.

Mr. President, you have oftentimes stated that it is the policy of the United States to seek a settlement of the conflict by peaceful means; that we do not seek either territory or permanent bases in South Vietnam; that we are ready to meet any place, any time and that we welcome "negotiations without preconditions."

Mr. President, I suggest that you initiate a courageous and dramatic step to move the Vietnam war from the battlefield to the conference table. I make the following proposals, which, hopefully and prayerfully may bring about an end to hostilities and the beginning of negotiations for peace.

Announce to the world that you have:

1. Set the date, fixed the time, and appointed the place for a peace conference on Vietnam. (Consider Asia or Geneva);
2. Sent invitations to North Vietnam, South Vietnam, the National Liberation Front and other interested parties to participate;
3. Agreed that twenty four (24) hours before the conference, as further evidence of our peaceful intentions, the United States will cease aerial bombings in North Vietnam, pending the appearance of Hanoi at the Peace table;
4. Agreed that seventy-two (72) hours, after the conference starts, there shall be a reciprocal cease-fire coupled with a cessation of all movement of troops and materiel while negotiations are being carried on in good faith. Provision for removal of the sick and wounded and movement of food, clothing and medical supplies, under appropriate inspection and supervision shall be made;
5. Agreed that if items 3 and 4 above have been complied with—then 48 hours after the cease fire, the Secretary of State will be present at the negotiations to meet with his counter parts of the other nations invited to the conference;
6. Agreed that the agenda to be mutually agreed upon may include the 14 points of the United States, the 4 points of the Hanoi government, the Geneva agreements of 1954 and 1962, and such other items which the parties may by mutual agreement add;
7. Extended an invitation to the co-chairman of the Geneva Conference, (the Soviet Union, and Great Britain), to the members of the International Control Commission (India, Canada and Poland) and to the Secretary

General of the United Nations to take part in the conference.

Mr. President, by making these proposals you will have announced to the world and to our concerned citizens that the United States not only has the sincere desire, but also the determination to pursue peace, and that our government wants to see all killing and destruction stopped. By these proposals you will have seized initiative and given to the world the full measure of the continuing efforts of the United States to achieve a peaceful settlement.

Mr. President, you now have an excellent opportunity for creative diplomacy and dynamic statesmanship. Let us hope and pray that North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front will recognize our good intentions and come to the peace table. If they do, both sides will have gained much. Should they fail to appear, let the eyes of the world behold the empty chairs and let the ears of the world hear the thunder of the silence from those invited—but unrepresented at the peace table.

Lead us, Mr. President, in once again taking the first steps on the path of de-escalation and on the path towards peace. The world will recognize that you heeded the words of the Prophet Zechariah, 9: 10, who said: "And he shall speak peace unto the nations".

This act of courage and magnanimity will be applauded by the entire world and our citizens at home.

Respectfully,

HERBERT TENZER,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully urge my colleagues to express their views on my peace conference proposal.

Commendation to Minnesota Future Farmer of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 24, 1966

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, the Minnesota Future Farmers of America organization is one of the best organized and most active in the Nation. I would like to commend the young men taking part in the many programs as well as Mr. W. J. Kortsemaki, Minnesota Future Farmers of America executive secretary.

The Minnesota FFA has begun an exciting statewide wildlife habitat program which has received support from sportsmen's club, the Minnesota State Conservation Department, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Soil Conservation Service.

FFA members are to be congratulated for taking part in many programs: First, Operation Coverup in which the FFA helped to screen 15 to 20 dumpgrounds and junkyards by tree plantings. Second, keep Minnesota clean and scenic. Third, trash-burner program in which members construct rubbish burners in their farm shops and make them available to local communities. Fourth, raising ducks and pheasants as well as distribution of the birds. Fifth, cooperating with the Farmers Union in their Green Thumb and debris